S.F.T.S
LIBRARY
E20A

Vol. XVIII, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1959

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

CONTENTS

Page

COVENANT PATTERNS IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE FOR BIBLICAL STUDIES 65
By J. A. Thompson, Esq., M.A., M.Sc., B.D., B.Ed., Lecturer in Old Testament Studies, Baptist Theological College, Sydney.

WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY: SOME GUIDANCE FROM ST. PAUL 75
By the Rev. C. Stewart Petrie, B.A., B.D., Stawell, Vic.

CORRESPONDENCE 85

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES 88
(See inside back cover.)

PRICE: THREE SHILLINGS

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.
THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.
THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.
THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D., Dunedin.
THE REV. PRINCIPAL D. S. HOPKIRK, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., Melbourne.
THE REV. PRINCIPAL D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil., Sydney.
THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., Edinburgh.
THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.
THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne
THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed., Brisbane.

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in the exposition of the Christian Faith. The Editors are not responsible for every opinion that may be expressed.

ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded to the Editors, The Manse, 573 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, E.2, Victoria, Australia. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O. Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:
Ten Shillings, including postage. (Foreign, 10/6; U.S.A., $1.20.)

THE
REFORMED
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XVIII, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1959

Covenant Patterns in the Ancient Near East and Their Significance for Biblical Studies

The term covenant (Hebrew-Berith) occurs more than 200 times in the Old Testament indicating that the concept played an important part in the thinking of Israel. Apart from those passages where the term occurs directly, there are many places in the Old Testament where the thinking is in terms of the covenant pattern. The earliest occurrence of the word is in Genesis 6:18 and the latest in Malachi 3:1. In all, 26 books of the Old Testament use the term directly, so that in the minds of the final editors of these books, it was believed that the idea was as old as Noah, and was still in use in the days of Malachi.

The origin of the word is still disputed, although the idea is now known to be very old.[1] The present paper is designed to give a brief review of recent discovery and discussion, and to show how interesting new approaches may now be made to some old problems.

An important paper published in 1954 by G. E. Mendenhall, of the University of Michigan,[2] took up the important juristic analysis of ancient Hittite treaties which had been presented in 1931 by V. Korosec.[3] In Mendenhall's paper an attempt was made to show that the covenant pattern commonly used in the Vassal treaties of the Hittites in the years preceding the Exodus of Israel from Egypt, became a pattern for the expression of Israel's covenant with YHWH. He claimed that this type of treaty was set out in the form of a particular literary genre and he went on to argue that this way of drawing up a treaty was peculiar to the latter half of the second millennium B.C. He asserted that "this particular structure of covenants is not attested for any other subsequent period. Though it is to be expected that survival of the form outlasted the Hittite Empire, it is perfectly clear that the home of this form is in the first millennium B.C.

1. W. F. Albright claims that the Accadian word **beritu** found in commercial documents from Qatna dating to c. 1350 B.C. is a non-biblical occurrence of the word.
2. G. E. Mendenhall, **Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East** (Pittsburg, 1955).
3. V. Korosec, **Hethitische Staatsvertraege**, (Leipsig, 1931).

and cannot be proven (outside Israel) to have survived elsewhere."[4]

In this opinion Mendenhall was wrong but at the time he lacked certain evidence which has now become available. It is clear to-day that the particular literary form in which covenants were drawn up was used as early as 1500 B.C. and continued in use till at least 700 B.C. Other covenants of the same general type are now available from the Assyrians,[5] the Aramaeans,[6] and the people of Ugarit.[7] It remains a fact, however, that at the time Israel came into being as a nation, the concept of covenant was well established in the Near East and the form in which it was expressed legally was fairly well standardised.

An understanding of the secular symbol is of course important. It is a commonplace to state that God very often spoke to men by adapting some well-known secular motif. Thus the ideas of slave redemption and of adoption which were well-known examples of legal procedure in the ancient world, were taken up by Paul in order to make plain the nature of divine activity in the matter of salvation. In like manner the legal concept of covenant was used in order to expound to Israel the theological concept of election. G. E. Wright has remarked,[8] "The doctrine of election found its most concrete expression in the Old Testament language of the covenant. This term was borrowed from the realm of law and given a special theological application." W. Eichrodt, the well-known Old Testament scholar from the Continent, has written a complete Theology of the Old Testament around the theme of covenant. Probably his emphasis should rather be on election, but from the legal angle there is no doubt that the notion of covenant was wrought into the warp and woof of Israel's religious thinking.

Covenant Patterns in the Ancient Near East.

We have indicated that there is abundant evidence to-day that the idea of covenant was widespread in the ancient Near East. There was a wide variety of covenants ranging from those arranged between individuals to those between nations. The covenants between individuals are not without significance for the total picture, but we shall confine ourselves to those between nations. These were of two kinds, the so-called "parity" treaties between kings

4. G. E. Mendenhall, op. cit., p. 35.
5. D. J. Wiseman, The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon—**IRAQ**, Vol. xx, 1958.
6. J. A. Fitzmeyer, The Aramaic Suzerainty Treaty from Sefire in the Museum of Beirut, **Catholic Biblical Quarterly**, Vol. xx.
7. J. Nougayrol, **Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit** (Paris, 1955).
8. G. E. Wright, **The Old Testament against its Environment** (London, 1953), p. 54.

or princes who were on equal terms, and those between strong kings and their vassals, the so-called "suzerainty" treaties. It is this latter treaty that is so important for Biblical theology. Since the Hittite records of this type of treaty are well preserved, and since in any case other treaties followed this pattern very closely, it will suffice for us to outline the typical Hittite suzerainty covenant.

It seems likely there were probably nine sections to such a treaty.[9] It began with a *Preamble* in which the names, titles, attributes and genealogy of the great king were set out. There followed the *Historical Prologue* in which the past relations of the parties were described with a special emphasis on the benevolence of the great king towards the vassal. In this section there was quite commonly an "I-Thou" form of address. Next came the *Stipulations* where the obligations imposed on the vassal were set out in each detail. Such items as the prohibition of enmity against the great king, prohibition of other alliances, the need for loyalty, the obligation to answer a call to arms and to appear annually before the king to bring tribute, the need to submit all disputes to the king, and other similar clauses which were to the advantage of the king, were set out in detail. Actually the vassal had some rights and it is to be supposed that in matters not specifically listed he had liberty of action, provided that he did not infringe the rights of the King. The succession to the vassal throne had to be approved by the King. Following the stipulations came a clause requiring the *deposition of the covenant document in the temple* and an order to read it annually to the people. Then came the list of gods who acted as *witnesses* to the treaty including in many cases the gods both of the King and of the vassal. Quite regularly this was followed by a list of *curses and blessings* designed to provide some kind of religious sanction. Three more items can be inferred although extant documents do not show them. These were the *formal oath*, the *solemn ceremony* at which the treaty was ratified and the oath taken, and finally some procedure for dealing with a rebellious vassal.

Biblical Covenants.

The Old Testament has, as we have noticed, a wide variety of covenants. Some of these are of a personal kind such as those between David and Jonathan (1 Sam. 18:1-5; 20:1-16) or between Jacob and Laban (Gen. 31:44ff.), although one may argue that these are rather of the parity

9. G. E. Mendenhall, op. cit., p. 32f.

type. Others are quite clearly of the parity type as for example the covenant between Abraham and Abimelech (Gen. 26:28ff.). God's covenant with Israel as a nation at Sinai (Ex. 19) is of the suzerainty type. Assuming for a moment the validity of the older documentary hypothesis about the composition of the Pentateuch we notice that all sections of the Pentateuch whether the J, the E, the D or the P document refer to the idea of covenant.[10] The Pentateuch as we now have it from the hand of its final editor presents a picture of narrowing election taking place in mankind with a covenant concluding each stage in man's early history. The first was the covenant with Noah of which the sign or token was the rainbow. The second was the covenant with Abraham the father of the chosen people, with circumcision as the sign (Gen. 17:1-14). The climax of early history came with the covenant of Sinai when God condescended to "tabernacle" with his people. The sign of this covenant was the sabbath.

If we look at these three covenants more closely we observe some important facts. In the first place the covenants with Noah and with Abraham are different both from the Sinai covenant and from any of the secular covenants in the East. In these two, while there is a resemblance in expression between them and the secular covenants, there is a difference in inner meaning. It is God, th great King, who swears to certain promises to be carried out in the future. He is full of bountiful intentions towards the other party. In the case of the covenant with Abraham there is something more precise in the statement of the promise. It is specified as a land and a seed. In the Biblical narratives which may be found in Genesis chapters 12, 13, 15, and 17 we may detect some of the covenant themes like the historical prelude, the promises, the blessings and curses, the oath, the religious ceremony. Nothing is said about obligations laid upon Abraham although the obligation of devoted service to God Who was so gracious is implied. It is God Who acts out of His own initiative for the blessing of Abraham. The great King is God, and He is indeed the benevolent Giver, in contrast with the Hittite king who claimed benevolence, but stood to gain more than he gave.

When we come to the covenant of Sinai there is much more of the pattern of the secular covenant to be seen. There are clear obligations to be accepted by Israel, although no obligations are imposed on YHWH. He had of course accepted these before ever the covenant was

10. G. E. Wright, op. cit., p. 62.

made. His protection and support were presupposed. If we consider the total picture we can detect the historical prologue in Exodus 19:4 with its I-Thou form of expression. The stipulations fall into two groups, the first being obligations to God the great King (commandments 1-4), and the second being obligations towards fellow-Israelites (commandment 6-10).

The covenant of Sinai is treated in other passages in the Pentateuch and in these some of the other elements of the covenant pattern can be detected. Thus there is a provision for the placing of the tables of the covenant in the ark, an account of the religious ceremony (Ex. 24) with details about the sprinkling of the blood of the covenant and possibly of a sacred meal. No specific references to witnesses or to a formal oath occur, but there are in several places references to the blessings and curses that are associated with he keeping or the rejection of the covenant obligations. Again the public reading of the commandments is enjoined in several places. Altogether there is abundant evidence of the use of the same literary genre as we find in the Hittite covenants. We insist, however, that it was not the formal legal covenant that was important, but the prior election of Israel to be God's covenant people, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood and a peculiar people. Here was a remarkable combination of privilege and obligation. The use of the concept of covenant with its particular vocabulary drawn from the realm of jurisprudence helped to give expression to the prior fact of election, and the legal manner of expressing it helped to underline the obligations under which Israel lived both in relation to God and to her fellows.

A second passage where the same literary genre is evident is to be found in Joshua 24 where there is an account of the assembly of Israel's leaders at Shechem. There is a preamble in which the name of God is simply "YHWH God of Israel." Then follows a historical prelude of some length couched in the I-Thou form. There are many references to the activity of God on behalf of His people (vv. 3-14). Stipulations are not given but are implied, for in verse 16 it is recorded that the people answered, "God forbid that we should forsake the Lord to serve other gods." This formula is in the nature of an oath. The people are charged not to serve other gods (v. 20). There is a reference to witnesses although the people are their own witnesses (v. 22) The concluding verses refer to the committing of the covenant to writing and to the setting up of a monument as a testimony, hard by the sanctuary of YHWH.

These two covenants at Sinai and at Shechem are the most detailed in the Old Testament, although there are other passages where the same pattern can be discerned, as for example in Joshua 8:30-35, Leviticus 26 and Deauteronomy 27.

Applications of the covenant idea to certain Old Testament problems.

(a) *The Decalogue, Exodus 20.*

We suggest that the Decalogue may be interpreted as a summary of the contents of the section of the covenant document that set out the stipulations to which the people of Israel gave assent. Exodus 20:3-11 may be interpreted as the group of stipulations that governed the relations between YHWH and His people, while verses 12-17 give the group that has reference to the relations between the pople of YHWH and their fellows. In the first group of obligations Israel was forbidden to make or to worship other gods of any kind, or to take the name of YHWH in vain. All evil usage or profanation of the divine Name was forbidden for the Name was inseparable from the Person. Every use of His Name was an abuse, unless it had the honour of God as its aim. Thus was the honour of the great King perserved. A special day was set apart in which He might be honoured. Indeed as an extension of this, other days might be set apart for the remembrance of the past mercies of God and for acts of confession or worship.

Alongside these obligations towards God the King were those towards all other Israelites who took the oath of allegiance to YHWH and were thus as individuals in covenant relation with the great King. Exodus 20:12-17 covers all such relationships including those with parents. There could be no peace in the land where murder, lying, stealing, adultery or covetousness was to be found. Quite possibly the present form in which these commandments are expressed is an expansion of a simpler statement of them. But the general pattern of these laws is in keeping with the kind of thing that was known in the East in the days of Moses. Obviously we have here a background against which to interpret the preaching of the prophets. When the individual Israelite oppressed his brother in any way at all, he was breaking the covenant with God. It was as serious a crime to offend against the regulations that governed relations with one's fellows as it was to break a law against the King. In the secular realm, infringement of obligations to a fellow-vassal might lead to tension

inside the King's domains, and this would upset the balance and possibly lead to war. Such infringements were punished in the secular realm with all severity. So also Israel might expect that God the great King over all might visit with severe judgment those who broke the covenant by disregarding their obligations to their fellows.

(b) *The ritual decalogue of Exodus 34:12-26.*

Scholars of a former generation sought to demonstrate the presence of a ritual decalogue in these verses.[11] The reference in Exodus 34:28 to the "ten words" led to the conclusion that there were here ten commandments. The context deals quite obviously with ritual material and it was thus imagined that the whole section might be arranged into ten laws of a ritual kind. It was held at the time that this ritual decalogue was an older one and was attributed to J, whereas the decalogue of Exodus 20 was younger being ascribed to E. (Note that it has an alternative in D, in Deuteronomy 5.) But when it came to arranging the passage into ten separate laws, real difficulty arose. Indeed it seems that few scholars can agree on just how to divide up the passage.

We now suggest in the light of this recent discussion on covenants in the ancient East, that these verses in Exodus 34 are an extension of the more formal statement in the covenant agreement, of the obligations due to God. An inspection of these verses will show that they highlight the point that Israel is not to make a covenant with any other god or people. This is implied in Exodus 20 but it is enlarged here and given clearer expression. The prohibition of marriages with the heathen round about is closely parallel in principle with the prohibition of an alliance between one of the Hittite vassals and an enemy of the King. In Exodus 34 the religious rituals were all designed to strengthen the covenant between God and His people. It is true that these are not formally stated in Exodus 20, but that chapter is merely a summary of the covenant. However, the reference to sabbath observance in verses 8-11 points to an important principle. In Exodus 34 the feast days of verses 18-26 are an extension of this principle of the setting apart of a day for YHWH. The setting apart of several days provided opportunity for the remembrance of several of the great historical events in which God acted on behalf of His people. Passages in other books of the Pentateuch lead us to believe that there was a long list of ritual obligations laid on Israel. Von

11. See for example EXODUS in the Century Bible by W. H. Bennett, pp. 255ff.

Rad[12] has shown that in the so-called Holiness Code (Lev. 17-26) we may isolate similar blocks of ancient law which set out the obligations of the man of Israel both to God and to his fellow-Israelite. Hence we suggest that we should not look into Exodus 34 for a ritual decalogue but rather for a re-emphasis of certain aspects of the covenant obligations.

(c) *An interpretation of the Deuteronomic Reform of 621 B.C.*

It was Wellhausen, towards the end of the last century, who advanced the idea that the notion of covenant was unknown as early as Moses but was peculiarly the emphasis of the reformers of Josiah's time.[13] The idea was the creation of the prophets from Elijah onwards, but it found its first elaborate expression in the so-called Deuteronomic literature of the seventh century B.C. The material we have been presenting in this paper would point to the fact that this earlier opinion was wrong. If it can be sustained that the concept of covenant was a very ancient one in the Near East (and we hold that there is abundant evidence for this to-day), and if we recognise that the tribes of Israel were bound together into a sort of amphictyonic league in the days of Moses which persisted on into the days of the Judges and up until the kingdom was established, then we are in a position to make a new approach to the various reforms referred to in the Old Testament. The reform in the days of Josiah is a case in point. Now while one aspect of this reform was certainly the attempt to centralise worship at Jerusalem and to exclude all other sanctuaries, there was far more in it than that. Indeed we may well argue that the idea of centralisation was actually a minor emphasis, the chief object of the reform being t he purification of the worship of God's people and the desire to promote their obedience to God's law in all matters of life. In other words we may interpret this reform in 621 B.C. as a serious attempt to recall Israel to the simple faith of the Sinai covenant. G. E. Wright among others has protested strongly against the earlier view. He has recently written[14] "Deuteronomy with its lucid expression of the covenant theology can no longer be viewed as a pious forgery of the seventh century. While expanded and edited, its fundamental traditions were derived from the old amphictyonic circles in North

12. G. Von Rad, **Studies in Deuteronomy** (London, 1953), pp. 25ff.
13. Wellhausen, **Prolegomena to the History of Israel** (English trans., 1885), p. 417.
14. G. E. Wright, **The Old Testament against its environment** (London, 1953), p. 62.

Israel." Then he quotes with approval the recent discussion of Von Rad in his "Studies in Deuteronomy (1948)."

(d) *The Nostalgia of some of the prophets and some of the exclusive groups for the desert life of the days of the Exodus.*

In more than one place in the prophetic writings we have what seem to be nostalgic glances back to the former days in the desert just after the escape from Egypt. Perhaps no prophet stated the desire more clearly than Hosea. For him God would take His wayward people back to the wilderness where He would woo them again. He would betroth Israel afresh in righteousness, in justice, in steadfast love, in mercy, and in faithfulness — all great Old Testament words which characterise the God of Israel and which ought to characterise the people of God also. The reason for this nostalgia may well have been that Hosea and others realised that what Israel needed above all else was a return to the covenant, in obedience to which there would be blessing both material and spiritual. One of the great words connected with the idea of covenant is "hesed," i.e., "steadfast loyalty." (N. H. Snaith has worked out the meaning of this word in some detail in his "The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament.") Israel had failed to be loyal. At Sinai she declared "All that the Lord hath spoken we will do." She needed to make that declaration again in true sincerity. Where might she make it better than in the desert, divorced from all the allurements of Canaan, and separated from all those enemies of God with whom she had entered into covenants in the centuries since Sinai. In other words the nostalgia of the prophets was not simply for the desert life, but for the covenant relationship with YHWH.

(e) *Some apparently incidental items associated with biblical Covenants.*

There are several apparently insignificant items to be noted in biblical covenants such as change of name, the erection of some symbolic monument, and the exchange of items of clothing. There is evidence from the ancient East that this kind of thing was done in a variety of covenant arrangements. Garments and shoes were passed between the parties in some of the Nuzi transactions, and gifts of garments were regularly sent by vassals to their overlords. Assyrian documents show that it was a regular practice for Assyrian kings to set up some symbol of their authority in the conquered state. This may explain the setting up of the altar by Ahaz in the Temple in Jerusalem

(2 Ki. 16:9f.). D. J. Wiseman has recently commented on the fact that garments did in fact play an important part in covenant ritual in Mari and Alalakh. The phrase "to lay hold of the horn (hem) of a garment" means "to place oneself under the jurisdiction of" another.[15] We suspect that in the covenant between Jonathan and David in which Jonathan gave to David his robe, his garment, his sword, his bow and his girdle, the surrender of these items may well have had some covenant significance. As to the change in name which is evidenced in the case of Abraham and also in the cases of the sons of Josiah, we still await some clear evidence from the documents of the ancient East. We sense that in many of these items there was symbolical significance.

(f) *The range of the covenant idea in the Hebrew Bible.*

There are probably many passages in the Bible where a basically covenant symbolism lies behind the present narrative. In one direction progress has been made, however, in the identification of passages which are in a covenant context. W. F. Albright[16] has recently pointed out that the word *berith* is normally replaced by the word *'eduth* in the so-called Priestly code. In Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and in scattered references in other books, the ark of the covenant *'aron berith* is at times referred to as the ark of testimony *'aron 'eduth* (Ex. 25:22; 26:33, 34; 30:6, 26; 31:7, etc.). The tables of stone on which the commandments were written are referred to as tables of the covenant (Deut. 9:9, 11, 15), or the tables of the testimony (Ex. 31:18, etc.). In this connection Exodus 34:28-29 is significant for here we read that Moses wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten words. When he returned from the mountain the two "tables of testimony" were in his hand. Again the place where the covenant was deposited is referred to as the tabernacle *mishkan*, the tent of the congregation *'ohel mo'ed* (Ex.30:36), the tent of the testimony *mishkan 'ohel 'eduth* (Ex. 40:2-3) and the tabernacle of witness *'ohel ha 'eduth* (Num. 17:8). Generally *'eduth* means "a reminder" or a "testimony." But Albright traces it back to an older word *'adoth* meaning "covenant," a word which also occurs in the form *'adim*. This means that there are twice as many references to the covenant between YHWH and His people in the Hebrew Bible as we had supposed. Even if many of these occur in the Priestly Code, this need not militate against the view that they are old, for recent work points

15. D. J. Wiseman, Abban and Alalakh, **Journal of Cuneiform Studies**, Vol. xii, p. 129.
16. W. F. Albright, **From Stone Age to Christianity** (New York, 1957), p. 16.

towards the recognition of the considerable age of much of this material. Incidentally in many of the places where *'eduth* replaces *berith*, we are concerned with details about the sanctuary where the "ten words" were deposited. This reminds us of the Hittite covenants which were deposited in the Temple and were produced periodically for public reading.

Conclusion.

The general conclusion which comes out of our discussion is that the covenant motif so clearly expressed in the Bible, especially from the days of Moses onwards, was one that was quite at home in the ancient East in the centuries 1500-700 B.C. An understanding of the range of use and the structure of the secular covenant provides an important basis for the interpretation of the biblical picture. With this symbolism we may proceed to the understanding of a variety of hitherto obscure passages. Moreover, a knowledge of the secular covenant pattern will lead to the recognition of divergences from that pattern in the Bible and so provide material for the theological interpretation of the biblical concept of covenant. And again, the identification of the whole range of biblical passages which have to do with the covenant idea, will lead to the isolation of the special vocabulary which came to be used by biblical writers in expressing this relationship between YHWH and His people. Such a study can provide valuable exegetical data on which theological interpretation may rest.

J. A. THOMPSON

Women and the Ministry: Some Guidance from St. Paul

Among the controversial themes in current trends of theological fashion, that concerning the ordination of women to the ministry is persistently being thrust into the foreground for consideration, as of paramount importance for the continued well-being of the Church. Any full assessment of the claims and implications that arise would involve excursion into the much wider doctrines of the Church and the Ministry, both of which themselves are in need of considerably more understanding and clarification if the prevailing confusion and uncertainty are to be resolved. For the present, the more restricted quest is undertaken of seeking such guidance as may be found in the writings of St. Paul, where he touches upon the position of women. For this purpose it is not proposed to

discard any of the letters generally attributed to the apostle. The most confident denial to him of epistles such as Ephesians or the Pastorals is largely offset by the acknowledgment that even these have a very strong Pauline background and content.

The apostle Paul has from time to time suffered many harsh things at the hands of his interpreters, the chief offenders, of course, being those who would seek his patronage for an issue already determined in their own minds, or those who for their own reasons are in any case predisposed to resent his counsel. Not least has he been maligned for the attitude towards women that has been wished upon him, an ungracious streak of misogyny being read into his occasional writings as its result. At best this sub-Christian outlook is either minimized or tolerantly excused on the grounds of his earlier Jewish upbringing and his inevitable subservience to the long-established customs of his day. At worst he is stigmatized as a forthright woman-hater, who was in pressing need — if the recently reported opinion of some who profess an expertness in such experimentations be correct — of psychoanalysis and consequent readjustment. But this is not new: even in his lifetime literal stigmata were not unknown to the chief of the apostles.

The charge of antipathy to the opposite sex is firmly refuted from numerous passages in his own writings, as, for instance, the cordial salutations to women given in Romans 16, the grateful recognition recorded in Philippians 4, and the high commendation offered in the early verses of 2 Timothy. Constructively, the dignity of womanhood is enhanced by Paul's noble conception of marriage, most tellingly set forth when he applies the figure of husband and wife to Christ and His Church, with great emphasis on Christ's cherishing the Church, in Ephesians 5:22-33.

In the search for guidance from St. Paul, it is essential to stress the precariousness of playing with isolated verses. If texts are simply listed and set off against each other in a nice balance of words, it is impossible to reach worthwhile conclusions. Thus, to call on single verses, we may observe that, whereas Galatians 3:28 declares that there are no distinctions of sex, Ephesians 5:22 requires wives to be in subordination to their husbands; and, although in 1 Corinthians 11:5 women apparently are permitted to speak when Christians come together, yet in 14:34 they are enjoined to silence. We must seek to discover whether there is a consistent teaching in which these seeming contradictions are resolved. In any case, it is to be observed

that those who are most anxious to rely on solitary verses to sustain their cause frequently show much reluctance in attending to context and circumstances.

A satisfactory understanding of Paul's standpoint in regard to women certainly cannot be gained from selected sentences treated in isolation. Besides, whilst he is not unready to offer immediate and concise guidance on specific points that arise, it is generally noticeable that Paul judiciously avoids petty rules for trivial occasions. He will be observed rather to enunciate great guiding principles which his readers must be wise enough to heed and to apply.

One such principle is set forth in his great epistle of freedom to the Galatians. He brings his readers to see how, in contrast with their former state of pupillage under the law, they are now in full sonship. "Ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus" (3:26). Then he goes on to affirm, "There is no Jew nor Greek, there is no slave nor free, there is no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (3:28). We must not take from Paul the credit of so clearly enunciating this principle. But he is not alone in recognizing it. It runs through the New Testament in one form or another, beginning from Peter's perception at Joppa that "God is no respecter of persons" (Acts 10:34). Indeed, it is adumbrated in Deuteronomy 10:17. But of course it was in the life of Jesus that the theory was truly revealed in practice. We recall that His ministry of teaching and healing was to men and women without distinction, perhaps reminding ourselves specially of His attitude to women as shown in His interview with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well (John 4), in the ministrations He accepted from certain women of substance (Luke 8), in His treatment of the woman taken in adultery (John 8), or in the joy of friendship that He shared in a Bethany home (Luke 10, John 11).

From his Master, Paul has learned that "In Christ" all are one. Race or class or sex precludes no-one from acceptance into the family of God. Sex confers no spiritual preference. Men and women alike are regarded as persons, none having the right to special privileges, none handicapped by special disability.

Yet this emancipating declaration has been quaintly overpressed and distorted. It is quoted to enforce the view that in Christ immediately all differences literally and completely vanish. With this dissolution of all sex distinctions, men and women are at once in all respects on an equal footing, sharing without any discrimination the same activities and responsibilities. It is insisted that the

only real equality existing in Christ is that which in its application at once resolutely and finally obliterates all differences of sex.

But this is thoroughly to misunderstand Paul's meaning. It is wrongly to turn oneness into identity. Paul is concerned with the spiritual status of those who are "in Christ." His principle gives special emphasis to the truth that God is no respecter of persons, that in Christ everyone, regardless of race or class or sex, has the standing of a person who is a child of God. This principle pervades the new life in Christ. It is not relaxed when Paul deliberately persuades the slave Onesimus to return to his master Philemon. Nor is it contradicted when Paul continues to observe the proprieties pertaining to the relationships between men and women. The Christian community continues as male and female. It is not an asexual society whose members are unsexed as in Christ they are accepted into the family of God. But as men remain "Jew" or "Greek," without being compelled to renounce their nationality and live in some non-political state, as they may continue "bond" or "free" without change to their social standing, inevitably more so must they retain their characteristics as "male and female," even while they are accepted, and must accept one another, as "all one in Christ Jesus." For each is now in his own right a person, neither more nor less than a child of God, "in Christ Jesus."

Now it was the *mis*-application of this principle with which Paul has to contend at Corinth, and with which in consequence he deals in the first epistle to the church there, chapters 11 and 14. So eager apparently were some of the women to assert their new-found emancipation in Christ, to demonstrate their spiritual equality with men in Him, that they did at least two things that were not customarily attributed to their sex. Some of them had promptly discarded one of the most distinctive of womanly habits and had appeared in the gatherings for prayer with unveiled heads. Others seemingly had gone further by taking some speaking part in the public services, but whether this was by claiming the right to preach or by asking questions we cannot say with certainty.

Wherein lay the real impropriety of their behaviour? That the head covering was discarded in a city nortorious for its immorality, where the woman who went abroad unveiled thereby unmistakably advertised herself as a shameless hussy, may be part of the picture, but it is not the essential part. In dealing with disorders in Christian worship — and obviously there were many in Corinth —

Paul is concerned with much more than the observance of outward decorum. The covering of the head was of significance both as indicating woman's subordination to men and also, more positively, as marking her true sphere which was found in the home. So, by divesting herself of the covering, she was not merely setting herself on an equality alongside her male fellow-worshippers, but she was by her demeanour disdaining the womanly obligations which were peculiarly hers and which she alone could fulfil.

This is the first step towards undue self-assertion, and there went along with it a consequent depreciation, leading to avoidance and neglect, of her own essential characteristics. Paul is therefore at pains to deal with the problem in some detail. Later, in enjoining women to be silent in the services, he does not need to cover all the ground again, but insists that they be "in subordination" according to "the law." In 1 Timothy 2:12, a sharper tone appears: women are forbidden in this way "to domineer" *(authentein)*.

To meet this situation at Corinth, with its hazardous implications, Paul is impelled to recall another fundamental principle which does not contradict his words to the Galatians but is complementary to what is said there. Whilst remaining true to his insistence that men and women are persons without distinction in Christ, he nevertheless refuses to ignore the God-given and therefore fundamental differences between the sexes, which in the Christian community are rightly neither belittled nor magnified. The precise details of his presentation and application may sometimes be difficult and even obscure for us, but there can be no doubt as to the general tenor of his argument. That Paul's direction may be unpalatable to those who despise scriptural guidance in this "enlightened" age is beside the point. Its truth is ultimately inescapable.

The basis of Paul's teaching is clear and unequivocal: "I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (1 Corinthians 11:3).

Some who are disposed to accept Paul's teaching with qualification insist that here Paul is speaking only of the married state, and that consequently he did not intend any general application. It is argued that, since *aner* may mean either "man" or "husband," and *gyne* may mean either "woman" or "wife," the reference here, in conformity with Paul's teaching elsewhere regarding the subordination of wife to husband, is concerned only with those who are married. It is thus not a general statement for all, but

should be restricted to mean, "The head of the wife is the husband." Some add their own grammatical rules to give support to the rendering.[1]

But this would appear to be against the required sense of the passage. "The head of every man *(andros)* is Christ." *Aner* is obviously used here instead of the more general *anthropos* in preparation for the antithesis with *gyne*. If *aner* in the second clause be rendered "husband," it should also be similarly translated in the first clause: "the head of every husband is Christ." Those who arbitrarily shift throughout the passage from "man" to " husband" and from "women" to "wife" are hardly consistent and appear to be pressing some private interpretation.

In other places, Paul writes specifically concerning husbands and wives, but here he appears to be dealing with man and woman generally, not merely with husband and wife. Yet, as will be pointed out later, were the restriction allowed, it would not affect the main position. For the present, in any case, we may regard the relevant burden of Paul's declaration to be that "the head of the woman is the man," and, a little later, "the woman is the glory, i.e., the reflection *(doxa)* of the man."

It is generally agreed that Paul is appealing to the early naratives in Genesis, and so some consideration must now be given to these. In Genesis 1 we read that "God created man in his own image . . . male and female" (v. 27f.), to have dominion and to be fruitful and multiply. This is a general statement, but what it says is important: not just "man," but "male and female." In chapter 2 the story is told differently. There man is created first, and afterwards, since it is not good that he should be alone, he is given a helper, "meet" for him, that is, corresponding to him, befitting his dignity. She is taken from his side, and he recognizes her as belong to him: "she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (vv. 23-24). The significance of this narrative is carefully and fairly brought out by S. R. Driver, it being designed, he says, "to set forth the moral and social relation of the sexes to each other, the dependence of woman upon man, her close relationship to him, and the foundation existing in nature for the attachment springing up between them, and for the feelings with which each should naturally regard the

1. So, e.g. recently, R. C. Prohl: **Woman in the Church** (Eerdman's, Grand Rapids, Michigan), 1957, p. 24.

other. The woman is formed out of the man's side: hence it is the wife's natural duty to be at hand, ready at all times to be a 'help' to her husband; it is the husband's natural duty ever to cherish and defend his wife, as part of his own self."[2] The events of chapter 3 do not change the relationship; they result in its being underlined and emphasized: "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee" (v 16). The implicit dependence of 2:21ff. is now made explicit. (The punishment of the man furnishes a parallel: although sentenced to toil for his bread, he had already been appointed to work (2:15) before "the fall.")

The Danish scholar, Professor Johs. Pedersen, has summed up this aspect of the creation stories. "In both accounts man and woman are indissolubly bound together, but the closeness of the connection is differently expressed." In the first narrative, "singular and plural are used indifferently about the same being. Man is a whole consisting of two parts, the man and the woman. Nothing is said of the relation between them, except that they are indispensable to each other, and not till they are united do they together form a whole human being." In the second narrative, "Yahweh first created man, i.e., the man. The man is himself man, but he lacks something that he may be so wholly." The needed help is given in woman. "She is taken out of him, and thus she must be there, in order that he may be man wholly. She is part of him." "Thus the shade of difference between the two accounts is that, according to the former, the man and the woman together make man, while according to the latter the man is man proper, though the woman is necessary in order that he may be man wholly."[3]

These aspects of the Genesis narratives have been stressed because of their importance for the understanding of Paul. From them there emerge three relevant points. First, in the New Testament understanding of the creation stories, these stories are treated as a whole, and Paul does not anticipate modern source theories. Our Lord's use, too, is an instance of this treatment of them as a whole: "From the beginning of the creation, male and female made he them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the twain shall become one flesh: so that they are no more twain, but one flesh" (Mark 10:6-8; Matthew 19:4-6). Here words from Genesis I and 2 are brought together regardless of any

2. **The Book of Genesis** (Westminster Commentaries, Methuen & Co., London), 12th edn., reprinted 1954, pp. 42-43.
3. **Israel: Its Life and Culture**, I-II (Oxford Univ. Press, London), reprinted 1946, pp. 61-62.

modern recognition of different sources. Consequently, in seeking to interpret Paul's use of Genesis, it is quite misleading to separate what he has, like his Master, kept together. It is to the Genesis passages as a whole that Paul turns.[4]

The second point is that, in Pederson's phrase, "man and woman are indissolubly bound together." This truth runs through the narratives. "Male and female created he them." "It is not good for the man to be alone." "They shall be one flesh." When to these significant assertions is added the charge of Genesis 1:28, "Be fruitful, and multiply," it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the divine purpose was to be fulfilled by the union of the two sexes in marriage. For man to be alone, and no less for woman, in God's plan, "is not good." This receives support from two of the ten commandments, either of which, in our own day, we ignore at our peril. Paul himself reminds us that "the first commandment with promise" is that which says, "Honour thy father and mother" (Ephesians 6:2) — particular honour, that is, not to one's elders in any general sense, but specifically to parents, father *and* mother. The seventh commandment more directly concerns the preservation of the sanctity of marriage. Again, these both have our Lord's full endorsement. (See Matthew 15:4-6, Mark 7:10-13, Luke 2:51; Matthew 19:6, Mark 10:9.)

So, when Paul turns to Genesis for support, he is thinking of the normal man and woman who are indissolubly bound together in fulfilment of the Creator's expressed purpose. It is this which makes the choice in 1 Corinthians 11 between "man and woman" and "husband and wife" finally irrelevant. Marriage is the norm.

What of those who do not attain fulfilment in marriage? Jesus recognized that there were some who accepted celibacy "for the kingdom of heaven's sake" (Matthew 19:12), but neither he, nor Paul after him, recommended this form of self-renunciation as the ideal. It is the exception, not the rule. In 1 Corinthians 7, where Paul treats of the matter, he is not giving a general dissertation on marriage; he is seeking to meet particular difficulties in what are not normal circumstances. He frankly admits that he has "no commandment of the Lord" (v. 25) to offer the unmarried. The most he can offer is an opinion which, he makes clear, is qualified as "good

4. Separation of the Genesis stories, with emphasis on the "contradictions," and the "exegesis" that follows, detract from the value of Miss M. E. Thrall's study, **The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood** (S.C.M. Press, London, 1958), in face of her persuasive style.

for the present distress" (v. 27), because "the time is short" (v. 29).

The third point is that, while indicating that man and woman are complementary to each other, the Genesis passages at the same time set woman in subordination to man. On this subordinate relationship Paul's teaching hinges, not only in 1 Corinthians, but also in Ephesians 5:22ff. and 1 Timothy 2:11ff. It is reasonable to assume a similar basis for Colossians 3:18f. (Compare 1 Timothy 3:4, 12; Titus 2:4-5; 1 Peter 3:1-7.)

This vexed question of "subjection" or, rather, "subordination" goes to the heart of the matter. Understanding is not promoted but hindered by the persistent suggestion, mistaken or wilful, that "subordination" implies inferiority; and it is to be deplored that encouragement of an "inferiority complex" is allowed to confuse the issue. Is it possible to lay the persistent bogy of woman's alleged "inferiority," a notion to which neither Jesus nor Paul subscribes? The bogy has arisen chiefly through distortion of the Genesis narratives or non-acceptance of their true implications, and then through the consequent reluctance to admit the validity of Paul's teaching.

The verb that he uses is *hypotassesthai,* and the noun is *hypotage.* The terms are used of the woman, who is to "subordinate" herself or be in "subordination." They are not used of the man as if he is to "subordinate" the woman. Our word "subordination," which is a literal, Latinized rendering, preserves the basic idea, that of "ranking under." The fact is frequently emphasized but it seems so difficult of acceptance that, at the risk of repeating the obvious, it must be reiterated: this "subordination" does not mean "inferiority." There may be variation in the "ranking," but there is no derogation of the person. Paul in no wise revokes his assurance that "in Christ" all have the same filial standing before God. "There is no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." The declared spiritual status of woman is unassailable. Yet Paul does not, for he cannot, banish the divinely ordained characteristics that mark the differences of sex. "Male and female created he them." In this life at any rate, not even for those who are "in Christ" can any amount of verbal agility or wishful thinking eradicate or reverse the God-given sex distinctions. And, commensurate with a parity of persons, goes the subordination of woman to man by divine decree.

That subordination does not mean inferiority is brought out by Paul's frequent reminder that Christian relationships recognize mutual rights and obligations of

the sexes. The interdependence of man and woman is particularly stressed for those who are "in the Lord" (1 Corinthians 11:11). Even though woman was originally taken from man, every man subsequently has been born of woman; but all things, including man and woman and their relationships, "are of God" (v. 12). Moreover, if wives are called upon to subordinate themselves to their husbands, husbands are no less enjoined to love their wives (Ephesians 5:22-23, Colossians 3:18-19, and compare also 1 Peter 3:7).

Paul is not propounding theories of his own devising. What he writes is based on neither sentiment nor masculine prejudice. He is aiming to expound the divine purpose to Christian readers. He shows how the interrelationships of men and women, their complementary personalities, their mutual obligations and duties, must accord with and strive to fulfil their natural, that is to say their God-given, endowments, which includes woman's subordination to man.

The contemporary plea for the acceptance of women into the ministry of the Church, whatever guise it may take, is ultimately bound up with the modern "emancipation" of woman and the general intolerance of restraint. The factors involved are many and complex in this movement for unfettered "freedom." Much good has come of it, but not all is gain. There is much that is mistaken, and a great deal that is wrong. "He that goeth onward," we need to be reminded, "and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God" (2 John 9). Not all "advancement" is genuine progress.

In woman's desire to assert her complete equality with man, more is being lost than feminine graces. The arrival in society of the "career woman," so often strenuously trying, by aping the male, to mollify a festering grievance that she was burdened at birth with the wrong sex; the popular acceptance by society of the working wife and mother who is impelled to augment the family income by force of dread economic pressures or blatantly in pursuit of luxurious living; the equally accepted parental absenteeism that inevitably victimizes children and encourages delinquency; the prevailing sexual license and the ready turning to divorce, which are bringing marriage into contempt — these are among the disquieting manifestations that are associated with the "modern" woman's repudiation of those privileges and responsibilities that are uniquely feminine. Man, who is aiding and abetting her in the desire to deplore or spurn her sex, may co-operatively don an

apron or manipulate the washing machine, but nature utterly debars him from taking her place as wife and mother.

St. Paul would undoubtedly endorse to-day some wise words that were uttered thirty years ago. "The world wants desperately, not female priests and bishops, but Christian wives and mothers. When the home is, as S. Chrysostom calls it, 'a little church,' there is a firm foundation laid on which can be built the fabric of a female ministry in society, various enough to give scope to the richest individual gifts, and wide enough to satisfy the keenest individual zeal. The only equality of the sexes which the Church can rightly make the basis of its practical system recognizes differences of natural function and accepts the principle of subordination in common service. Sex is a factor of such importance that any attempt to ignore it in the sphere of ecclesiastical order must defeat itself. Only by frankly admitting difference can genuine equality be secured. Subordination is the very principle of ordered society, and it has its first expression and ultimate sanction in the Home."[5]

These words have even more relevance to-day. "Modern" is a specious term, wondrous in its propaganda value. It is required of us, however, that we do not yield to the clamant urgings of any popular "modern" majority, but that we do the will of God.

C. STEWART PETRIE

Correspondence

REPLY TO FATHER HEBERT

Sir,

Father Hebert does me the unusual honour of putting before our readers his complaints concerning my review of Packer's *"Fundamentalism" and the Word of God.* I must confess that at first I was a little distressed to hear from a highly esteemed man who knows me as belonging to a church that has solemnly pledged itself to the doctrine of the verbal inspiration and inerrancy of Holy Scripture that in my review I had been "so carried away by Dr. Packer's most attractive style as to bestow so glowing an encomium on his book and on the utterances of the Papal *magisterium* about the Bible since 1870." Dr. Packer will be surprised to read about the dangerous effect of his style even on critical readers. But I think our Venerable Father Hebert has rendered to us all a great service by compelling us to state clearly the REAL *status controversiae.*

The strength of Dr. Packer's argument lies in the fact that he defends an old dogma of the Church, indeed a doctrine older than the Church, and that he proves it from Scripture. It is the doctrine confessed by all "Catholic" churches, East and West, and equally by the

5. H. H. Henson: "The Ordination of Women," Presidential Address to the Durham Diocesan Conference, March 24th, 1928, reprinted in **Bishoprick Papers** (Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 10.

churches of the Reformation, that Holy Scripture in its entirety and in all its parts *is* the Word of God, given by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and, therefore, infallible. The importance of Packer's book lies in the seriousness with which he tries to restore this dogma at a time when many Churches — Anglican, Reformed and Lutheran in the same degree — seem to have given it up as untenable in view of modern science and historical scholarship. What would the Fathers of the Church of England, the martyrs of the 16th century who died for the *sola scriptura* as well as the great Anglo-Catholics of the 19th century say about the Resolution on the Bible by the Lambeth Conference of 1958? Though the latter would accept the statement that the Church is both guardian and interpreter of the Holy Scripture, they would ask whether this guardianship can be in keeping with the failure to confess the Catholic dogma of the Bible as the Word of God. The Evangelicals, on the other hand, would ask what it means that "the Church may teach nothing 'as necessary for eternal salvation but what may be concluded and proved by the Scripture.'" The fathers who formulated Art. VI (speaking of "read in" instead of "concluded") believed in the possibility of Scriptural proof because to them Scripture was the inerrant, sufficient and perspicuous Word of God. If this understanding of Scripture is abandoned, then another authority must be added, be it the Church (Lambeth, 1958), or Tradition, as it is done in the following statement by Archbishop Fisher: "The Church of England believes that the Holy Spirit of God, the only final authority, speaks to us in Holy Scripture, in the tradition of the Church and in the living thought and experience of today. Thus there is a threefold cord, each single strand of which, unrelated to the others, leads astray" (*Redeeming the Situation*, 1948, p. 43). Here the *sola scriptura* of the Reformation is lost. Packer's book is the most forceful and the most convincing attempt to restore this fundamental principle of the Reformation, also the English Reformation. "The supreme Judge . . . in whose sentence we are to rest, can be no other but the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scripture." Commenting on this quotation from the Westminster Confession (1, 10), Packer says: "Tradition may not be so lightly dismissed. But neither may it be made a separate authority apart from Scripture. Like every commentary on the Bible, it must itself be tested and, where necessary, corrected by the Bible which it seeks to expound" (p. 48). "The Church collectively, and the Christian individually, can and do err, and the inerrant Scripture must ever be allowed to speak and correct them" (ibidem).

This is the real issue. Has Father Hebert seen it? His own doctrine on the relationship between Church and Scripture (*Fundamentalism and the Church*, p. 34) suffers from the same lack of clarity as that of the utterances of the Papal *magisterium* which he quotes in support of his view. On the one hand the superiority of the Scriptures is recognised: they are given to the Church. On the other hand "the Church did exist before the Bible, and the books were written within the Church and later formed into a Canon . . . by the Church; but the Church is subject to the Lord, and depends on Him for her salvation. So, living by the tradition of faith, that is of faith in Him, and indwelt by the Spirit, she has known and knows now what are the books that testify of Him." Does she know that with absolute certainty, as Rome thinks? If not, must we then not clearly reaffirm the *sola scriptura* of the Reformation? And is it really true that the Church existed before the Bible? This is most certainly not true of the Church of the New Testament. The entire preaching of our Lord from the beginning (Luke 4:17ff) to the end (Matth. 24:15, 30) is exposition of the Scriptures. And as the Risen Lord explains the Law, the prophets, the scriptures (Luke 24:25ff.; 44ff), so the preaching of the

apostles since Pentecost (Act. 2:16ff) is exposition of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. It is not necessary to remind a scholar like Father Hebert who always has emphasised the connection between the Old and the New Testament of the fact that the entire life, work and suffering of our Lord was meant by Himself to be the fulfilment of Scripture. However, if that is so, we must draw our conclusions for the doctrine *de Sacra Scriptura*. If the Scriptures were to Him the Word of God, they must be that to us. There can be no faith in Christ without acceptance of everything which to Him was the Word of God. I fail to see how it can be denied that He and His apostles shared the belief of the Old Testament People of God in the inspiration of the Scriptures. His terminology (e.g., "How then doth David in *spirit* call him Lord," Matth. 22:43, comp. "the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake," Acts 1:16) corresponds exactly to that of the Rabbis (see for details the material collected by Billerbeck vol. IV, p. 415-51). This view of the Bible is the common basis of the controversies of Jesus with His adversaries and of the controversy between Paul and the Judaists and between Church and Synagogue. The issue is always the right understanding of the Scripture whose divine origin and authority is recognised by either side.

As to the understanding of the nature of inerrancy, this is, indeed, the great problem for all churches today. We agree with Father Hebert about the impossibility of a rationalistic equation of the Biblical idea of truth with what we understand in ordinary life or even in philosophy by truth. He himself has shown that there is no faith in the Biblical sense without the acceptance of historical facts, without the assent of the intellect. He as well as Dr. Packer and the reviewer are agreed that there is not such a thing in the Bible as truth that would not include also "propositional truth." Also Father Hebert knows that I cannot believe in God without believing "that he is" (Hebr. 11:6) and that I cannot believe in Christ without accepting the facts of His life (John 20:31; 21:28). We are furthermore agreed that we must not allow the belief in the truth of the Bible to deteriorate into a supranaturalistic philosophy, a sort of gnosis as we find it in certain sects that claim to teach the truth of the Bible, and that, on the other hand, we cannot accept a "theology" in which the factual content of the Christian faith has evaporated in a philosophy of values (Ritschl's school), or in existentialism (Bultmann). We disagree in the question of inerrancy. What constitutes an error which would destroy the divine character of the Scriptures? What do we mean by error? Is it an error if the Old Testament gives, in the way of ancient historians, figures which are not meant to be statistical figures in our sense? Did the Holy Ghost commit or permit errors when He allowed Stephen and Paul to so use the Greek Bible with its deviations from the Hebrew text? All these problems must be investigated. However, they can be fruitfully discussed only if we are one in the acceptance of the Bible as the Word of God, given by inspiration, not because this is the dogma of the Church from the beginning, but because Jesus Christ, who is content and Lord of the Scriptures, tells us so. If we fail to listen in obedient faith to this voice, then our churches are most certainly going to lose the Scriptures and to leave them to Rome. This should be, and certainly is, our common concern.

H. SASSE.

Immanuel Theological Seminary,
North Adelaide.

Book Reviews

THE NATURE AND AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE

By Raymond Abba (James Clarke & Co., London), 1958, pp. XVI and 333; 21/-.

The former students of Camden College, Sydney, where the author was Principal in 1948-55, as well as his many friends in Australia will welcome Professor Abba's book. It will win him more friends among the educated laymen who are longing for better information on the vital religious questions. It is to them that the author wants to pass on "the chief fruits of twentieth century biblical scholarship" (p. XI). In eight chapters (What is the Bible?; The Interpretation of the Bible; Revelation through History; Myth, Legend and History; Miracles; The Old Testament and the New; Differing Levels of Truth; The Word of God) the great problems which the Bible presents to modern man are discussed in a very lucid way. A lot of information is given, especially on problems of Old and New Testament Introduction. Almost everywhere the author proves himself as well informed, especially in Biblical theology proper. Not so good are the historical remarks on the Reformers where the author had to reply on secondary literature which does not do justice to Luther and Calvin. Naturally, the dogmatic problems, as e.g., the problem of the authority of the Bible, cannot be solved in such a comprehensive volume. But the author shows, by wrestling seriously with them, what the problems are and encourages the reader to think for himself. An appendix summarises some results from the investigations of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Excellent indexes follow. Ample and well chosen quotations show the wide reading of the author. As in almost all English books on such a topic the great contribution of modern Roman theology is completely overlooked. We should ask ourselves whether this can go on and whether the thorough discussion of all our problems in the works on *Theologia Fundamentalis* is not more important than the theologically poor products of our "Fundamentalism." The author is a representative of modern English biblical theology which combines biblical scholarship with a real theological understanding of the divine revelation. His judgments (e.g., on Fundamentalism, p. 63 f.) are well balanced and fair. Wherever our Australian laymen are still under the spell of the old liberalism this book should be recommended to them for study and for group-discussions.

H. SASSE.

TRACTS AND TREATISES

By John Calvin. Vols. I, II and III (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1958, pp. cxxxviii, 352; xxxi, 592; xvi, 521: Set $15,00. Single volumes $6.00.

The historian of the Reformation will rejoice in the fact that Calvin's *Tracts and Treatises* have now been reprinted from the edition published by the Calvin Translation Society in 1844. These documents are of first importance. It is always a matter for astonishment that Calvin, in the midst of the demands of an exacting pastorate, was able to engage in theological debate on such a wide front. He had read deeply in both classical and patristic literature, and he used to the full his profound scholarship in the service of biblical truth. These documents are a singular example of the manner in which evangelical truth can be used as a test-stone both of faith and practice.

The first volume contains Beza's attractive and invaluable life of Calvin, and then Cardinal Sadolet's letter to the senate and people of Geneva (after Calvin's expulsion), together with Calvin's reply. Several

minor works are included: Articles agreed upon by the Faculty of Sacred Theology of Paris with Calvin's Antidote; the letter of Pope Paul III to the Emperor Charles V with Calvin's remarks on the letter, and an Admonition concerning Relics. The major work in this volume is Calvin's treatise on "The Necessity of Reforming the Church," which was dedicated to the Emperor Charles V and submitted to the Diet of Speyer in the year 1544. This work lays down fundamental principles drawn directly from the word of God. It is a powerful corrective of false doctrine and unbiblical practice.

The second volume is concerned with the doctrine and practice of the Church: it contains the Catechism of the Church in Geneva, and a number of prayers and orders of services for special occasions: for administering the Sacraments, for celebrating marriages, for visiting the sick. There are two Confessions of Faith, and several expositions of the Sacraments, including the important treatise: "The True Partaking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ."

The third volume is devoted to the defence of the Reformed Faith: to the refutation of the decrees and dogmas of the Council of Trent, and an answer to the *Interium* entitled: "The True Method of Giving Peace to Christendom and of Reforming the Church." Two tracts are included in opposition to the errors of the Papists and of the Anabaptists: "On Shunning the Unlawful Rites of the Ungodly, and Preserving the Purity of Christian Religion," and "Psychopannychia: Or, a Refutation of the Error that the Soul sleeps in the Interval between Death and Judgement."

The first volume is prefaced by a substantial and learned monograph by Professor T. F. Torrance. He demonstrates how radical was the break which Calvin made with the mediaeval church: and he points out how great are the differences between the presuppositions of the one and the presuppositions of the other. Calvin had little patience for the "sophistry" and the "frigid philosophy" of the Scholastics. This prefare is a useful and informative piece of historical and theological writing. Torrance condenses and summarises Calvin's arguments in the successive works, and shows their perennial relevance and significance. A final word of appreciation must be addressed to Eerdmans for their commendable enterprise in republishing the works of Calvin.

S. BARTON BABBAGE.

JUNG AND ST. PAUL

By David Cox (Longmans, London), 1959, pp. 357; 39/9 (Aust.).

The subtitle is: "A study of the doctrine of justification by faith and its relation to the concept of individuation." The method followed is to compare the ideas of Jung concerning the movement of man towards his goal, culminating in his concept of "individuation," with the Christian way as represented in the Pauline thought, centring around his doctrine of justification. Noting that there is great overlapping between the concerns of psychotherapy and religion, and that there seems to be real conflict between their conclusions, he sets out to discover what there is in common between them, and at what points they are incompatible. His method has real advantages, for the static examination of concepts that is often used, fails to do justice to either psychotherapy or the Christian way. But here the concepts are compared only as they emerge in the dynamic understandings of the life process represented by Jung and St. Paul. Further, Jung is a happy choice, for he is professedly religious and claims that his thought is compatible with a "Protestant" understanding of life!

For the reviewer, however, the task is anything but simple. There is a triple question: (a) does he represent Jung's thought adequately,

(b) is he correct in his exposition of the Pauline meaning of justification in its relation to the whole of the Christian life, and (c) is his comparison of the two ways satisfactory and enlightening?

(a) From a meagre acquaintance with Jung, I can only say that his treatment seems to be good; and on comparison of this analysis with others, there seems to be reasonable ground for saying that the presentation is both fair and enlightening. The theological reader will find the exposition highly fascinating, and will see quickly that the reason why Jung is able to feel that he is still within the "Protestant" camp is that he was acquainted in his early years with the thought of post-Hegelian liberalism.

(b) His exposition of justification again reflects real competence. In fact his analysis and criticism of many recent attempts to interpret Paul is of some importance. He draws out the hidden semi-Pelagian assumptions of men such as Dodd and Vincent Taylor, who give to faith an independent status, as a subjective quality or act which is seen as a necessary condition of justification. On the other hand, the attempt of men such as Nygren to deny that faith is a condition of justification and to define justification in terms of a new status rather than a change in character, is judged to be too formal and negative. Cox suggests that justification is offered to all men, but the condition is "penitence," which is the divinely wrought conviction that we cannot reach the goal by our own efforts, accompanied by a readiness to accept what God offers us in Christ. The faith that follows is not a condition of justification, but is itself justifying faith, as a gift of God. The whole treatment of justification is well worth reading.

(c) His comparison of the Pauline and Jungian ways is much harder to assess. Certainly he recognises that they are far from parallel, and exhibit striking differences. Nevertheless, he does show that they overlap considerably. This overlap suggests that the rise of psychiatric thinking in our time is confronting the Church with a great need to think through the issues of this relationship. That Cox solves the problems which emerge can scarcely be claimed; but that he points to significant issues can hardly be denied.

COLIN WILLIAMS.

ALLEGORY AND EVENT

A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture. By R. P. C. Hanson (S.C.M. Press, London), 1959, pp. 400; 35/-.

Particularity is essential to much modern understanding of the Bible. Universality, an equally abstract idea, is essential to Origen's understanding of the Bible. We have been much concerned with what was said and meant at particular places and times. Origen was concerned with the meaning of the words of scripture in all times and places, including now and here. For this reason, the modern reader is appalled by the liberties which Origen takes when he interprets Scripture. This incompatibility is evident when Dr. Hanson discusses Origen as Exegete and Allegorist. "He can sometimes exhibit a shrewdness on linguistic or critical points which would not be out of place from the pen of a modern commentator." (p. 182). But his own Platonism and the expediency of handling the Marcionites, Gnostics and Literalists bring him to a use of allegory which 'is totally unscriptural, totally uncritical, totally unreal.'" (p. 209). For Origen the apparent imperfections of Scripture are accommodations to our weakness. "But in as far as it was possible for us to hear, burdened as we were with flesh, so did the prophets speak to us, as the Lord accommo-

dated himself to human weakness for our salvation" (p. 225). Although Origen speaks of *oikonomia* and *dispensatio* he never quite comes to a doctrine of progressive revelation.

Origen, we are told, was never dogmatic, never offensive. The great value of the book under review is that it is both. The recurrence of the pronoun in the first person singular and the depreciation of the work of others which occupies a great part of the book are significant elements in the author's approach. For while others have endeavoured to see Origen from within and have illuminated our understanding of Origen, this work sees Origen from without (see basic question, p. 7) and illuminates our understanding of ourselves.

Origen's greatness is recognised. He met the challenges of his day. He did more for the science of exegesis than anyone else has done. His solution to the problems raised by the presence of the Jewish law in the Christian Bible may not be acceptable. "But few solutions of the problem have been as ingenious, and unsatisfactory though Origen's answer to this question is, no alternative answers which are any less unsatisfactory seem at the moment to be available" (p. 362). Origen does not take history seriously. For him, event is less important than allegory and particularity less important than universal truth. He does not hold the philosophy of history which is basic to much modern interpretation of the Bible (pp. 363-4) and which many feel can be found in the Bible itself.

Much of the book might suggest that while Origen interprets Scripture in his own way, we interpret it in God's. But Dr. Hanson's illuminating final chapter will not let us rest comfortably. "Now every generation of scholars approaches the Bible with a different series of presuppositions which have been largely supplied by contemporary thought, quite independently of the Bible itself . . . In the twentieth century our biblical exposition may well be distorted by the universally accepted and universally applied dogma of evolution and by an irrational fear of metaphysics" (pp. 368-9). The author concludes his work with a fine treatment of Scripture and tradition, but many searching questions remain.

Is our concept of history as metaphysical as Origen's Platonism? While our Idealist fathers followed one half of Hegel, have we and the Marxists followed the other half. Fearful of metaphysics, our historical language has sounded more earthy, but we should not like to have to produce empirical correlates for "the stream of history." Metaphysics on the move (p. 355) is still metaphysics. The great question is that which Bultmann puts to Dodd, "wie weit also seine Geschichtsbetrachtung eine *theologische* ist und ob sich nicht das theologische Verstandnis der Geschichte mit einem *geschichtsphilosophischen* verbindent." *(The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology.* p. 402).

Of two things we may be certain. Origen is not a dynamic twentieth century Protestant. Neither is God. Origen and others are important because they remind us of this latter truth.

E. F. OSBORN.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS: An Introduction and Commentary.
By Leon Morris (Tyndale Press, London) 1958, pp. 249; 9/6.

THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS: An Introduction and Commentary.
By R. V. G. Tasker (Tyndale Press, London), 1958, pp. 192; 8/6.

With these two commentaries on the Corinthian correspondence, the Tyndale series (which is also being published in America by Wm. Eerdmans in a slightly enlarged photolithoprinting and more attractive format) grows in stature. Both are sober and conservative in exegesis,

alert and scholarly, avoiding speculation, and confining attention to the elucidation of the text. Only 15 and 20 pages respectively are devoted to Introduction. On the other hand, it is disappointing that in a series professedly designed "to promote a truly biblical theology," more attempt is not made to present particular points dealt with in these letters in their relation to the whole of Pauline (and for that matter of New Testament) theology. This is true, for instance, of Dr. Morris' unhelpfully brief comment on "rewards" and "being saved so as by fire" in I Cor. 3:15, and of Prof. Tasker's discussion of the "house from heaven" in 2 Cor. 5. Questions are raised by such passages which the rest of scripture may help to answer, but our writers do not often indicate this.

Both commentators accept the recent conjectures that Paul paid a short and unannounced visit to Corinth between the writing of 1 Cor. and 2 Cor., and that following the visit he wrote a "severe" letter. Dr. Morris regards the visit as "fairly certain," and apparently accepts the severe letter without qualification. Tasker regards the visit as "a necessary inference" and the severe letter as "a necessary deduction." The latter recognises the novelty of conjectures, but says that the traditional view (that the severe letter is really 1 Cor.) "is seen to be increasingly improbable the more the Apostle's descriptions of it are considered," and rallies Ronald Knox to his support. Tasker, however, does not follow many moderns in their view that part of the severe letter has survived in 2 Cor. 10-13, or that 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 is a fragment of a yet earlier lost letter; he maintains the integrity of 2 Cor. His adherence to the modern reconstruction of events, however, naturally colours his commentary at a number of points. This disappointed the reviewer, who remains unconvinced by the theory. The "intermediate visit" is a conjecture resting on a conjecture, and, as such, is poor criticism on which to base exegesis. The first conjecture is that the hypothetical lost letter "explained" (to quote Tasker) "why he had not gone straight from Ephesus to Corinth." This rests on an anterior conjecture that Paul, during his hypothetical intermediate visit had promised to do this, notwithstanding such a promise was contrary to the plan outlined a week or two earlier in 1 Cor. 16:5-7. Further, an intermediate visit is probably ruled out by a straightforward interpretation of 2 Cor. 1:23 and Acts 19:22. In general, however, Tasker's exegesis is admirable, and the style is pleasing.

Dr. Morris has a more terse style than Tasker, which lends itself to handy and succinct treatment of such points as *sarkinos* v. *sarkikos* (3:3), or the use of *katangello* in 11:26 where the writer rightly takes exception to the theory of W. Bright's famous communion hymn, "We here present, etc." This whole section on the Lord's Supper is skilfully treated.

Some comments and quibbles: *pneumatikos* as applied to the wilderness food (10:3) is surely more than simply Paul's "way of directing attention to the heavenly origin of this food." Is it true that Paul in absence passed sentence on the offender "as president of the assembly" (5:3)? How is each believer's "laying by in store" on the first day of the week "evidence . . . that the Christians habitually observed that day?" There is an illuminating note on the woman's "power on her head because of the angels" (11:10). *Adokimos* in 9:27 is taken to mean "not that he might lose his salvation, but that he might lose his crown." The comment that 7:15 "seems to mean that the deserted partner is free to remarry" is unwarranted as exegesis; the verb here used is nowhere in Greek used of the marriage tie itself, and in any case such a provision (which is at variance with other N.T. teaching and with Paul's own principles in verses 11 and 27 and in Rom. 7:1-3) should rest on a more secure exegetical basis than this. Both commentators might have made clearer what doctrine of the

church they deduce from the epistles. Is "the church" in 1 Cor. 12 local or ecumenical, visible or invisible? Dr. Morris does not clearly indicate. And while Prof. Tasker seems to approve the Muratorian Fragment's concept of "one church . . . recognised as being spread over the entire world," he does not show that this ecumenical use of the word "church" is really Paul's.

Withal, two most serviceable commentaries on vital scriptures.

D. W. B. ROBINSON.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By Alan Richardson (S.C.M. Press, London), 1958, pp. 423; 30/-.

This book, which sets out to cover the whole wide field of New Testament theology, well deserves the excellent reviews which it has received; and probably most of the readers of this Journal have already begun to find how useful it is to them. But it is not easy to write a short review of it without dealing in detail with isolated points which one might wish to criticise; and naturally there are a few such points. It seems better, therefore, to take hold of one point which concerns the aim and purpose of the book, and which does not affect, so far as I can see, the main treatment of the theology of the New Testament, which, as I have said, seems to me to be very good.

It concerns the word "hypothesis," which appears only in the Preface, and is also given some prominence on the dust-cover. We read on p. 12 that in this book "the hypothesis is defended that Jesus himself is the author of the brilliant re-interpretation of the Old Testament scheme of salvation ('Old Testament theology') which is found in the New Testament, and that the events of the life, 'signs,' passion and resurrection of Jesus, as attested by the apostolic witness, can account for the 'data' of the New Testament better than any other hypothesis current today. It makes better 'sense,' or better history, than, for instance, the hypothesis that St. Paul (or someone else) transformed the simple ethical monotheism of a young Jewish carpenter-rabbi into a new mystery-religion of the dying-and-rising-god pattern with the crucified rabbi as its cult-hero."

It is important that a distinction should be made between any scheme of theology, such as this book gives, and the faith of the Church, as expressed for instance in the Creed, which remains the same through the centuries. Any scheme of theology will reflect the climate of the time to which it belongs, just as in scientific studies hypotheses are modified and improved upon (cf. pp. 11-12). So far the word "hypothesis" is right; and indeed it seems that today new theological questions are being asked by Bultmann and his disciples, as in James Robinson's new book, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, which this book does not at all answer. But the real trouble is that in the quotation just given the hypothesis which the book defends is orthodox Christian belief, and might even be deduced from the statements of the Creed, while the contrasted hypothesis is by the same standards heretical. Might it not be inferred that the Christian Faith is itself a hypothesis, an answer to the problems of man's life which fuller experience or research might prove to be insufficient?

But the Christian Faith itself is not a hypothesis. The Church proclaims, not as hypotheses but as facts, such things as the Reality of God, in contrast with our human notions of Him, and the taking by God of our manhood, and the salvation of man through the passion and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Ought not then a clear distinction to have been drawn in the Preface between these facts, these spiritual realities, which the Church calls upon us to confess

with a faith which involves self-committal, and the hypothesis which it is the high vocation of the theologian to construct, in order to expound the Faith in the language of the day?

GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

VISION AND PROPHECY IN AMOS

By John D. W. Watts (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1958, pp. 89; $3.00.

Were the prophets of Israel cult officials? Did they have a definite function to perform in the services of the sanctuaries? During recent years this has been one of the most constant subjects of debate among Old Testament scholars. It used to be said that, whatever may be thought of the other prophets, it was not true of Amos, the shepherd from the desert. But Professor Watts, of the Baptist Theological Seminary, Zürich, has no doubt about the connection of Amos with the cult. While he is not dogmatic concerning this connection, he insists that Amos had definite duties and functions to perform at the Northern shrines. He find it possible to interpret the famous reply of Amos to Amaziah in the seventh chapter to mean that while Amos would have preferred to be a shepherd he was diverted from this personal preference, and was compelled to accept the role of a prophet with all its cultic implications. (He makes no attempt to explain how a Southerner could obtain a place in the Northern sanctuaries).

Because of its relation to sanctuary worship — especially the celebration of the New Year festival — the material in the book of Amos, both visions and proclamations, follows definite cultic patterns; and these are carefully analysed by Professor Watts. According to him the prophet's activity in the Northern Kingdom ceased after Vision 3 in chapter 7; and Visions 4 (chapter 8) and 5 (chapter 9), with their eschatological significance, issue from his ministry at a Southern sanctuary. Thus Professor Watts is able to retain the whole of the text of Amos, even the much disputed ending of chapter 9. While all this exposition is most interesting, and is a tribute to the author's scholarship and enthusiasm, it is based too much on assumption. The reader will want to stop frequently and argue point after point as he makes his way through the book. If Professor Watts is right, the last thing one can expect from a prophet is spontaneity of speech. An Amos is "cabbined, cribbed, confined" by the exigencies of ritualistic and liturgical patterns.

Whatever one's views of the conclusions reached in this study, it is a serious and important contribution to the study of Amos.

H. MACLEAN.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and textual problems of the Great Exodus, by D. W. Gooding (Cambridge, London, 22/6). This work is No. 6 in the new series of Texts and Studies, edited by C. H. Dodd, and its author, a Research Fellow of the University of Durham, is to be congratulated on the brilliance of his first major work. Dr. Gooding's earlier work, *Recensions of the Septuagint Pentateuch,* has been noticed in this journal, and he has rapidly become one of the world's few expert Septuagint scholars. The problem dealt with in the present work is that of the notorious differences in the Septuagint of Exodus between chapters 25-31 (the instructions given to Moses for the making of the tabernacle and its furnishings) and chapters 35-40 (the carrying out of those instructions), and the differences of the latter section from the Massoretic Hebrew text. This had previously been accounted for by supposing that chapters 35-40 of the LXX were a fairly accurate translation of of Hebrew Vorlage which was different from and earlier than the Massoretic text. Dr. Gooding, however,

shows that, "the ommissions, mistranslations and additions not seldom reduced the Greek account to an absurdity of which no original Hebrew composition could possibly have been guilty" (p. 99) and argues convincingly that the Greek was carelessly translated with much paraphrasing, omission, and re-arrangement of the text. The work is completed with appendices on the suggested restoration of the Greek Text, and the manuscript evidence for the text of Exodus. Though the subject may be thought obscure, the argument is brilliant, and the conclusions strengthen our regained confidence in the Massoretic text. The work is also useful simply for its explanation of the apparatus of the tabernacle.

R. F. Hosking.

Risen Indeed, by G. D. Yarnold (Oxford, London, 15/9 Aust.). These brief theological and devotional studies generally maintain that "the resurrection appearances of our Lord are objective and physical, *plus* something more, at which the record can only hint" (p. 51). By contrast, however, "the angelic appearances are a kind of personification, or projection, of the spiritual apprehension of truth" (p. 17). Often suggestive, these studies embody some valuable insights. Critical questions are briefly considered in six appendices.

The Gospel of the Incarnation, by George S. Hendry (S.C.M., London, 15/-). In the manner of the modern ecumenist, the writer seeks the "wholeness" of the Gospel between the "partial" perspectives of Bethlehem and Calvary, in the total fact of the Incarnation of Christ, interpreted not as His consubstantiality but His co-existence with men. The bearing of the free gift of forgiveness in this personal relation constitutes the atonement. This existentialist interpretation of the Christ of Galilee, with its rejection of the concept of satisfaction, eliminates an objective atonement as memorably stated by James Denney, "that, but for Christ and His passion, God would not be to us what He is." This is a basic weakness in a book which contains much acute Christological and soterological discussion, concluding with a valuable chapter on "The Extension of the Incarnation," which is defined as "the presence of the Spirit in the Church; for the presence of the Spirit is the presence of Christ" (p. 159).

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, by George Smeaton (Banner of Truth Trust, London, 22/6 Aust.). This survey of theology — biblical, systematic, historical — from the viewpoint of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was originally published in 1882 with the object of elucidating orthodox doctrine as against the widely diffused current of contemporary Sabellianism emanating from Schleiermacher. The treatment of the subject, especially on its historical side, is most lucid and competent, the discussion of the issue relating to the *filioque* being particularly illuminating. In contrast, the relegation of the vital contribution of Calvin, whom Warfield designates pre-eminently "the theologian of the Holy Spirit," to less than three lines is totally inadequate and surprising from a Reformed theologian. However, this is a valuable and useful volume the reprinting of which is to be welcomed in the present situation which still reflects much of the prevailing modalism of the writer's day.

The Confession of Faith, by A. A. Hodge (Banner of Truth Trust, 22/6 Aust.). Published originally in 1869, this popular commentary on the Westminster Confession consists of an analysis of its chapters and sections, a consideration of the Scriptural bases and illustrations of its teaching, together with a series of appended questions. This lucid and compact exposition of "the consumate flower of the Reformed Confessions" (as the writer's successor at Princeton, Warfield, described it) remains a useful compendium of Christian doctrine.

The Prophet Jonah, by Hugh Martin, and *The Book of Zechariah,* by Thomas V. Moore (Banner of Truth Trust, 20/9 and 15/- Aust.). These commentaries, reprinted in the Genevan Series, largely antedate modern critical discussions, but their prevailing Christological exposition, being most relevant to our times, will provide fertile homiletic sources for the preacher.

Revival Year Sermons, by C. H. Spurgeon (Banner of Truth Trust, 10/- Aust.). The year 1859 witnessed both in America and the British Isles a widespread religious awakening in which a most significant figure was the youthful Spurgeon. These five sermons, delivered in the course of that year to an estimated congregation of eight thousand, manifest the evangelistic strength of his Calvinistic theology. Their centennial publication is welcome for the printed word in its vivid expression still reflects something of the power of this pulpit voice of Victorian England.

For Whom Did Christ Die? by R. B. Kuiper (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, $2.00). This embodies a discussion on the extent of the Atonement from the point of view of particularism as contrasted with both unrestricted and what is designated inconsistent universalism. The writer concludes, with Warfield, that "the Scriptures teach an eschatological universalism, but not an each-and-every universalism" (p. 97). The main value of this small volume lies in its trenchant criticism of the views of Barth by an orthodox Calvinist.

Institutes of the Christian Religion, by John Calvin (Eerdmans, $5.00 for two volumes). "The Institutes," asserts Professor John Murray in his Introduction, "is not only the classic of Christian theology; it is also a model of Christian devotion." This attractive and modestly priced issue of Beveridge's standard translation (published on the occasion of the quarter centenary of the definitive Latin edition) constitutes an event in introducing this classic to the ranks of the paper-backs.

Bible Doctrine. Unit Two, Book Two, by D. Partington Anderson (Orthodox Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, $1.85). This forms the final part of the Workbook on the Westminster Shorter Catechism covering the section on the Means of Grace. The catechetical teaching is clearly presented and amply illustrated in word and picture. With well selected questions related to the Scriptural bases and a suggestive guide appended for teachers, the whole work constitutes a useful manual for the instruction of young adolescents.

R. Swanton.

Book Reviews

Page

ABBA, RAYMOND: **The Nature and Authority of the Bible** .. 88
By the Rev. Professor Hermann Sasse, D.Theol., Immanuel Theological Seminary, North Adelaide.

CALVIN, JOHN: **Tracts and Treatises** 88
By the Very Rev. Principal S. Barton Babbage, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Ridley College, Melbourne.

COX, DAVID: **Jung and St. Paul** 89
By the Rev. Professor Colin Williams, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Queen's College, University of Melbourne.

HANSON, R. P. C.: **Allegory and Event** 90
By the Rev. Professor E. F. Osborn, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Queen's College, University of Melbourne.

MORRIS, LEON: **The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians** .. 91
By the Rev. D. W. B. Robinson, M.A., Vice-Principal, Moore Theological College, Sydney.

TASKER, R. V. G.: **The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians** 91
By the Rev. D. W. B. Robinson.

RICHARDSON, ALAN: **An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament** 93
By the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., D.D., S.S.M., St. Michael's House, Crafers, South Australia.

WATTS, JOHN D. W.: **Vision and Prophecy in Amos** 94
By the Rev. Principal Emeritus Hector Maclean, M.A., M.Sc., D.D., Melbourne.

SHORTER NOTICES 94

W. D. Vaughan Pty. Ltd. Print, 126-128 Denmark St., Kew.